

Serial No.: 10/807,266  
Docket No.: 101-1018  
Amendment dated June 18, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of March 19, 2008

## **REMARKS**

### **Introduction**

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that each of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of February 4, 2005 and March 24, 2004 have been considered, and also notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of the certificated copy of the priority document

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 8, 14, and 18 have been amended. Claim 22 has been added. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

### **Rejection under 35 USC § 101**

Claims 8-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 8 has been amended to recite "as a program" to comply with MPEP 2106 (IV) (B). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection on claims 8-13 is earnestly solicited.

### **Rejection under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0278741 to Robarts et al. (hereinafter "Robarts et al.") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0110503 to Perkes (hereinafter "Perkes"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

#### **Claims 1-7**

Independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to recite "whenever a channel is selected among the displayed EPG information as a new current channel, tuning the new current channel and updating the main PIG screen with turned moving pictures of the new

Serial No.: 10/807,266  
Docket No.: 101-1018  
Amendment dated June 18, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of March 19, 2008

current channel and the sub PIG screens with the captured pictures of non-selected channels and a captured picture of the previous current channel.”

Applicants respectfully submit that either alone or combination of Robarts et al and Perkes fails to show all limitations of independent claims 1 and 5. In particular, both Robarts et al and Perkes do not disclose or teach Applicants’ selecting a channel and updating the main PIG screen and the sub-PIG channel according to the selection of the channel, as recited in amended claims 1 and 5.

Although Robarts shows a program grid 178 and a preview window 190 with clips of a channel of the program grid 178, Robarts fails to disclose or suggest Applicants’ sub PIG screen and updating the sub PIG screen with captured pictures of non-selected channels and a captured picture of the previous current channel.

Moreover, although Perkes describes in paragraph [0272] the multiple picture-in-picture displays, Perkes fails to disclose or suggest Applicants’ main PIG screen and updating the main PIG screen with tuned moving pictures of a new current channel according to the selection of the channel as the new current channel.

Accordingly, either alone or combination of Robarts and Perkes fails to disclose or suggest Applicants’ invention as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 5.

Furthermore, even if it is possible to combine Robarts and Perkes, a combination of Robarts and Perkes would result in displaying the preview window 190 of Robarts and the multiple picture-in-picture displays of Perkes. That is, either alone or together of Robarts and Perkes neither discloses nor teaches Applicant’s main PIG screen, sub PIG screen, and updating, the the main PIG screen and the sub PIG screen with a selection of a channel of the displayed EPG information.

]Since either alone or together of Robarts and Perkes fails to show all limitations of independent claims 1 and 5, claims 1 and 5 are not obvious over Robarts in view of Perke, and deemed to be allowable. Dependent claims 2-4 and 6-7 are also deemed to be allowable due to their dependency of allowable claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/807,266  
Docket No.: 101-1018  
Amendment dated June 18, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of March 19, 2008

#### Claims 8--21

Independent claims 8, 14, and 18 have been amended to recite "selecting the second channel for main PIG screen from the displayed EPG information, tuning the selected second channel and updating the main PIG screen with a moving picture of the second channel and the sub PIG screens with a still picture of the first channel.

As described above with respect to claims 1-7, either alone or together of Robarts and Perkes fails to show Applicants' selection of the channel from the displayed EPG information, and updating the main PIG screen and the sub PIG screen with the still picture of the first channel of which moving picture has been previously displayed in the main PIG screen.

Since either alone or together of Robarts and Perkes fails to show all limitations of independent claims 8, 14, and 18, claims 8, 14, and 18 are not obvious over Robarts in view of Perke, and deemed to be allowable. Dependent claims 9-13, 15-17, and 19-21 are also deemed to be allowable due to their dependency of allowable claims 8, 14, and 18. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

#### New Claim

New claim 22 has been amended to recite, among other things, replacing the main PIG screen with a moving picture of the selected one of the channel map, and the sub PIG screen with still pictures of the other channels except the selected channel according to the selection of the one from the channel map. Support for new claim 22 can be found throughout the specification and drawings. Applicants respectfully submit that either alone or combination of Robarts and Perkes does not disclose or suggest all limitation of new claim 22. Accordingly, new claim 22 is deemed to be allowable.

Serial No.: 10/807,266  
Docket No.: 101-1018  
Amendment dated June 18, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action of March 19, 2008

**Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: June 18, 2008  
919 18<sup>th</sup> St., NW, Suite 440  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 775-1900  
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By:   
Seungman Kim  
Registration No. 50,012